

South Dakota [Mr. BULOW], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. DONAHEY], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senators from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER and Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HERRING], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. HOLT], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HUGHES], the Senators from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE and Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], the Senators from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR and Mr. STEWART], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senators from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE and Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH].

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce the following general pairs:

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS].

I am advised that my colleague, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. GIBSON], would vote "yea" if present.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] is absent on account of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 36, nays 14, as follows:

YEAS—36

Adams	Connally	Lucas	Schwartz
Ashurst	Danaher	McCarran	Sheppard
Bankhead	Davis	Mead	Thomas, Utah
Barkley	Gillette	Miller	Truman
Bone	Green	Minton	Van Nuys
Bunker	Guffey	Neely	Wagner
Byrnes	Hayden	O'Mahoney	Wallgren
Caraway	Johnson, Colo.	Reynolds	Wheeler
Chavez	King	Russell	Wiley

NAYS—14

Austin	Capper	Hale	Taft
Ball	Clark, Mo.	Holman	White
Burke	Frazier	Johnson, Calif.	
Byrd	Gurney	Nye	

NOT VOTING—46

Andrews	Ellender	Lee	Smathers
Bailey	George	Lodge	Smith
Barbour	Gerry	McKellar	Stewart
Bilbo	Gibson	McNary	Thomas, Idaho
Bridges	Glass	Maloney	Thomas, Okla.
Brooks	Harrison	Murray	Tobey
Brown	Hatch	Norris	Townsend
Bulow	Herring	Overtton	Tydings
Chandler	Hill	Pepper	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	Holt	Radcliffe	Walsh
Donahey	Hughes	Reed	
Downey	La Follette	Shipstead	

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, may the result be again announced?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There are 36 yeas and 14 nays. Therefore, the Senate advises and consents to the nomination of Mr. Madden.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be notified, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified.

POSTMASTER—JOHN LESTER GREENE

During the delivery of Mr. TAFT's speech,

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield to me?

Mr. TAFT. Certainly.

Mr. HAYDEN. By direction of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, I report favorably the nomination of John Lester Greene to be postmaster at Broken Arrow, Okla. I ask unanimous consent that the nomination be confirmed and the President notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEE in the chair). Is there objection to the present consideration of the nomination? The Chair hears none.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John Lester Greene to be postmaster at Broken Arrow, Okla.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed, and the President will be notified.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 11:30 o'clock a. m. tomorrow, to meet in the regular Senate Chamber.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, January 3, 1941, at 11:30 o'clock a. m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 2, (legislative day of November 19, 1940), 1941

UNITED STATES COURT OF CLAIMS

Joseph Warren Madden to be a judge of the United States Court of Claims.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Edward P. Warner to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board in the Department of Commerce.

POSTMASTER

John Lester Greene, Broken Arrow, Okla.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 2, 1941

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art above all things—all tumults, all conflicts, all life, and supreme from everlasting to everlasting—hear us while we pray; let the musings of the eternal mind murmur around us. In our relation to our country, our homes, the good, the bad, the rich, and the poor, we pray that the sweetness and the tenderness of the Christian spirit may assert itself. Oh, let our souls bring from the fields of valiant faith the living sheaves of God. Blessed Father, may the hungry have bread, the homeless shelter, and our people everywhere comfort; help us all to follow the heavenly music of our Master's message. Our loved ones near and far, ever keep them beneath the shadow of Thy wing. We rejoice that Thou hast been our dwelling place in all generations. Before the mountains were brought forth or ever Thou hadst formed the earth and the world, even from the beginning of time, Thou art God. Let Thy work appear unto Thy servants and Thy glory unto their children. When our course runs out at the ebb of the world that we love so dearly, may we have a welcome to our Father's arms, through Him who became the manger Babe but now is glorified forever as the world's Saviour. In our dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday, December 30, 1940, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 7965. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. T. G. Ramsey;

H. R. 10712. An act to permit the relinquishment or modification of certain restrictions upon the use of lands along the Natchez Trace Parkway in the village of French Camp, Miss.; and

H. J. Res. 623. Joint resolution to extend the date for filing a report by the United States Commission for the Celebra-

tion of the Two Hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas Jefferson.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the special orders of the day and the disposition of the legislative program today I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes on the proposal of the Federal Reserve Board.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered. There was no objection.

THE FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

AGAINST FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD PROPOSALS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Reserve Board, through Mr. Eccles, has made some very startling proposals. They are startling, coming from a Board that has caused this country so much misery and misfortune in the past. As one Member of Congress, I expect to oppose what Mr. Eccles has proposed to this Congress. We gave him power one time and he abused that power, and the Board on a number of occasions has abused its power. In 1936 and 1937 they doubled the reserve requirements of banks and thereby plowed under about \$3,000,000,000, and put this country into a tailspin from which we have not fully recovered.

I think instead of giving them more power we should abolish that Board and establish a new agency that will be an agency of the Congress to deal with these matters. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to ask the gentleman a question.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. But the gentleman has asked unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks, and I reserved the right to object. Let me ask the gentleman from Texas if it is not a fact also that the Federal Reserve Board, in 1920, right after the close of the World War, arbitrarily raised the rediscount rates and compelled the calling of loans that threw this country into a panic and broke practically every farmer in America?

Mr. PATMAN. I think the gentleman is correct in his statement.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield? Is it not a fact that one of the serious objections raised against the Federal Reserve Board is that they will not recognize soap wrappers as good money? [Laughter.]

Mr. RANKIN. I will say to the gentleman from Georgia that it is owing to whose soap was wrapped in it. They do not seem to recognize anything except the interest of a certain group of bankers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION FROM HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation:

DECEMBER 31, 1940.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,

Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have today transmitted a letter of resignation as a Representative in the Congress of the United States from the Eleventh District of Missouri to the Governor of Missouri, my resignation to become effective as of January 1, 1941, as upon that day I am taking the oath of office and qualifying as circuit attorney for the city of St. Louis.

Respectfully yours,

THOS. C. HENNINGS, Jr.

SIGNATURE TO ENROLLED BILLS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House the

Clerk may be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills passed by the two Houses and found duly enrolled.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered. There was no objection.

HOUSE CHAMBER

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that the temporary repairs to the Capitol have been completed and that the opening session of the Seventy-seventh Congress will be held in the Chamber of the House of Representatives at the Capitol at noon on Friday, January 3, 1941.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after disposition of matters on the Speaker's table and any other special orders I may be permitted to address the House for 8 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the disposition of the special orders already made I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the President's speech and to include therein a very favorable appraisal, an editorial from the New York Times.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON WILD LIFE CONSERVATION

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have until midnight tonight to file a report on behalf of the Select Committee on Wild Life Conservation pursuant to House Resolution 65.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this a unanimous report of the committee?

Mr. ROBERTSON. It is a unanimous report.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. There are no minority views?

Mr. ROBERTSON. It was revised today. I could not, therefore, file the report until today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein the text of a bill which I shall introduce tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House today for 8 minutes after the other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House today for 10 minutes at the conclusion of the other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein one resolution from the State Hotel Men of California and two resolutions from the California State Firemen's Association.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein

a speech delivered by Hon. Joe Hutcheson, Jr., United States circuit judge of Texas, at Stratford, Va., October 12, the anniversary of the death of General Lee. With the accompanying notes and quotations, it will exceed by one page the two pages allowed under the rule. I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding this I may extend it.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered. There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one-half minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered. There was no objection.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, if every local union in the country would take the attitude toward national defense that was taken by the members of Local Union 1864, S. W. O. C., of Berwick, Pa., in my congressional district, there would be no cessations of work on materials necessary for national defense. I quote from an article which appeared in the Berwick Enterprise:

WALK-OUT ENDS AS UNION VOTES TO RETURN TO WORK—RESPOND TO PRESIDENT'S PLEA OF NO CESSATION AND MEN BACK TODAY—SOLICITORS AT GATES

Members of Local Union 1864, S. W. O. C., voted to return to work today in response to the plea of the President of the United States that there be no cessations of work on national-defense contracts.

Feeling that it is their patriotic duty to cooperate with the national-defense program, the union members also voted to make up for the loss of the day's production by either working on a Saturday at straight time, or else working extra hours each evening at straight time until the time is made up, whichever the company desires.

A resolution adopted at the union meeting last night at West Side Park pointed out that the union feels that the stoppage of work yesterday was justifiable in the light of the incidents which provoked it, and that it was only because of the national emergency that the union took immediate steps to resume production and make up for any losses.

The members of the union are employed by the American Car & Foundry Co., which is engaged in building tractors.

I congratulate the members of Local 1864 on their good sense and patriotism.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein a short newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered. There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 6 minutes today after the other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered. There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, and include an editorial from the current issue of the Saturday Evening Post.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered. There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. COLE] may have an indefinite leave of absence on account of illness.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McCORMACK). The gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 647

Resolved, That the thanks of the House are presented to the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House of Representatives, for the able, impartial, and dignified manner in which he has presided over its deliberations and performed the arduous duties of the Chair.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues of the Seventy-sixth Congress, it is a distinct pleasure for me to offer this resolution on this occasion, which I believe we all will agree is the final session of this Congress. [Applause.] It is a pleasure to offer the resolution because it signifies my honest appraisal of a warm personal friend and one who has endeared himself to every Member of this House.

As majority leader the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] acquitted himself as a great American and as an able leader of a great party. He won the affection and respect of everyone, and we were all happy to see him elevated to the high position of Speaker. In the performance of the duties of the great office of Speaker he has given evidence of what we expected. He was able, impartial, and just, fully measuring up to the many brilliant Speakers who have preceded him. I am happy to pay through this resolution this tribute to a great American and a great parliamentarian.

I also wish to express at this time my appreciation of my good friend the gentleman from Massachusetts, who has lately been elected majority leader of the House. I have been privileged to enjoy his friendship for a good many years and I know the Democratic Party has honored itself in electing him to that high position.

If I may, I want also to express my appreciation to my own good friends on the Republican side of the aisle, who have so loyally supported me in my endeavors during the last 2 years. I am profoundly gratified and appreciative for their loyalty and splendid cooperation. [Applause.]

I wish to thank also those on the majority side for their many indications of approval and respect shown me. We all come to Congress actuated by but a single purpose, and that is to promote the welfare of the common country. We may differ as to how that objective may be achieved, but I believe all will agree with me we are all honest in our convictions and our purposes. That is what makes it possible for us to have such a splendid comradeship in the House. It is through honest differences of opinion and debate we reach the best conclusions. This is Americanism functioning in the American way. This must be continued if the people are to rule.

Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the resolution. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McCORMACK). The question is on agreeing to the resolution offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

The resolution was unanimously agreed to.

The SPEAKER. May I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] and all of my colleagues. Tomorrow I hope to have the opportunity of making a statement to the House of Representatives and the new Congress.

To those who are leaving us I want to say that you carry with you into private life our friendship and our high regard. Many of you we hope and expect to see back here some time in the future.

CHOCTAW INDIANS OF THE STATE OF MISSISSIPPI

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 3524) conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claims of the Choctaw Indians of the State of Mississippi and its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PITTENGER].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from Minnesota explain the bill?

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, this is a jurisdictional bill which was reported by the Committee on Indian Affairs. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHAFER] made a favorable report on this bill by direction of the Committee on Indian Affairs. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ROGERS] is interested in the bill. If he is here, I shall yield to him at this time for an explanation if he so desires.

This bill was framed to meet certain veto objections to another bill and, as I understand, it has the unanimous report of the Committee on Indian Affairs. The bill confers

jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to consider various Indian claims against the Government.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. These are claims that Congress has turned down in previous years?

Mr. PITTINGER. No; I do not think they have ever been presented to the Court of Claims.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. How old are these claims?

Mr. PITTINGER. I cannot say how old they are. They grew out of treaties and the failure of the United States Government to live up to its treaty obligations. There was only one objection to this bill when it was presented some 2 weeks ago and at that time it was not altogether an objection as I understand the situation. The request was made that it go over until another date.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. This permits the Indians to go to court and have their claims heard?

Mr. PITTINGER. That is correct. It does not involve an appropriation of money but simply permits the Indians to go into court, and if they have a legitimate claim under their treaties and dealings with the Government they will have a chance to establish that claim.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. How much money is involved?

Mr. PITTINGER. I do not believe I can state that. I do not think anyone knows.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I received a letter from the Department of Justice in reference to this bill and in its present form, as reported by the Committee on Indian Affairs, it is highly objectionable because it takes away from the Government the power to defend itself in the Court of Claims; therefore I object.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

AGRICULTURE AND THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, as the Representative of an agricultural State, and one who was sent to the Congress by the toiling farmers and the small businessmen of his district, I rise to voice my opposition to the most dangerous suggestions that have just been made by the representatives of the Federal Reserve System—a proposal to take from the Congress and the President of the United States and vest in the hands of a banker's fascisti the constitutional prerogative of controlling our monetary system.

The Constitution says that the Congress shall have the power to "coin money and regulate the value thereof"; yet, spread all over the front pages of the metropolitan press this morning, we find a suggestion by these bankers, these representatives of the vested interests, that the Congress and the administration surrender their prerogatives, their control over the finances of the Nation, and turn them over to these selfish interests, thereby establishing a financial fascisti in this country as dangerous, in my opinion, as any fascisti that exists in any other section of the world, so far as the toiling farmers of this country are concerned.

In 1920 the Federal Reserve System, under Gov. W. P. G. Harding, after collusion with certain big financial interests, and in the midst of crop time, when wheat, cotton, and corn were in the field, arbitrarily raised the rediscount rate and called loans all over the Nation, driving the prices of wheat, corn, cotton, hogs, lumber, and other raw materials far below the cost of production. It brought on one of the greatest depressions in all the history of the Nation and ruined farmers in every section of the country, and especially in the South and West.

In 1929, when the Hoover panic came on, they attempted to save a few big financial institutions, but let the farmers of the Nation go to ruin.

What they want to do now is free certain investments and guarantee that they will be paid for out of the blood and sweat of the American people. What they want to do is to stabilize the farmers of the country in their present misery. Agricultural prices are all out of line with the prices of things the farmer has to buy, with the result that the farmers of this Nation are losing their homes in every State in the Union.

They are selling wheat and cotton at the same price or below the price at which they were sold during the Taft administration, when the farmers of the West, joining with the farmers of the South, revolted and changed the administration. The large banking institutions and the large insurance companies own more farms today than in all the history of the country, and more farmers are going into bankruptcy because of the low prices of the things they have to sell.

I read to the Congress just the other day a statement showing that our program of limiting farm production has increased production of cotton in Brazil. Where they made less than 100,000 bales of cotton in the State of Sao Paulo, Brazil, in 1932, in 1939 they made 1,260,000 bales, which is more than the State of Mississippi will make this year, and remember that Mississippi is the second largest cotton-growing State in the Union.

It makes me sympathize with the farmers from the West and the Midwest who are complaining that their meat market is being transferred to Argentina when I see this condition prevailing throughout the length and breadth of the land.

If we agree to this proposal and take from ourselves and from the President this power of control over our financial system what can we hope for? Shall we continue to borrow from the rich to give to the unemployed poor, to pile up a national debt for our children and our children's children to pay interest on for the next thousand years? Does any intelligent man think that we can ever balance the Federal Budget on the present price levels? Are we to gather the gold of the world and bury it in the ground in Kentucky, denature it, if you please, and refuse to issue money against it, and then turn it over to this banking fascisti, while the farmers and small businessmen of the Nation are ground into the dust of depression and their hopes for recovery destroyed? I, for one, do not propose to remain silent while such a proposition is being advocated.

I was one of the men who introduced the bill to give the President the right to reduce the gold content of the dollar and to give him the right to issue \$3,000,000,000 in currency. My only regret is that he has not exercised it. If he had issued that \$3,000,000,000 in 1933, in my opinion we would have averted a great deal of the troubles through which we have passed.

The small farmer, the man who tries to own his own home, the man who is maintaining this Government, the man whose son volunteered first, is losing his home because he is compelled to sell his crops below the cost of production and to leave home and seek employment in some other enterprise in order that he may be able to meet his daily needs.

What are we coming to? What will the Republic be worth when you destroy these people who produce the raw materials that feed and clothe the world? What is the world fighting about today? Living space, soil, territory, raw materials of every kind of which we can produce an abundance.

If we follow this dangerous policy that is outlined by the Federal Reserve System, we will finish the strangulation of the toiling farmers of America. I for one do not propose to sit idly by and see them get by without a protest. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and include therein a resolution of inquiry regarding Nazi and Communist activities in the other American republics.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] is recognized for 8 minutes.

THE UNITED STATES AND THE EUROPEAN WAR

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, aside from any question of where the sympathies of the American people

lie in the present World War, and aside from any question of the extent to which the American people are willing to go in aiding Great Britain, Greece, and China in the wars, and aside from any question of whether or not the opposition of an overwhelming percentage of the American people against our becoming involved in the war has been changed by propaganda into a willingness to go part way into the conflict, it remains a grave and important fact that the American people, who will have to do the fighting and the dying and the paying in any war in which we are concerned, ought to be told frankly and candidly just whither we are bound, what steps are being taken to get us there, and what the military, economic, political, and sociological results will be.

Therefore, it is aside from all of these considerations, and solely in the interest of giving the people a chance to look squarely at facts which are having and will continue to have a grave bearing upon their welfare, if not their lives, that I am making this statement today.

The administration's proposal to make the United States "an arsenal" for Great Britain, Greece, and China is a proposal to take the United States into the war further and further, step by step, on the lease-lend plan without the consent of the Congress or of the people.

Of course the United States is in the war now—and has been for many months. We were taken into the war by Presidential action without the knowledge or consent of either the Congress or the people. That fact is not now denied by those who would deal frankly with this question.

The latest proposal to "lend" or "lease" equipment and munitions of war, food, clothing, and other necessities to Great Britain and her allies, and to China, is a proposal to give all these supplies and equipment to the belligerents on one side of the conflict. The shallow pretense that the billions piled upon billions of dollars' worth of equipment and supplies will be returned "in kind" after the war is so absurd as to be an insult to American intelligence. Not a dime or a dollar's worth of equipment or supplies "in kind" will ever come back to us after the war, and no one knows that any better than the President and his advisers.

Now that the neutrality statutes have been summarily kicked aside and the United States is in the war, actually if not actively and aggressively, the administration proposal is for us to act as the world's banker for war. That also means that after the war is ended we will be called upon to act as the world's banker for rehabilitation and recovery. That we will be propagandized to feed the world and to provide the money for rebuilding it after the war is over is just as certain as it is that we are being taken actively into the war now against the overwhelming opposition of the American people.

Our national debt will rise to uncounted billions not now even foreseeable or imaginable.

All of these are facts of today. Regardless of whether or not we agree or disagree with the policy behind them, it certainly is true that the American people ought to face squarely the facts and the fruits of the administration's policy so the Nation may know whither we are being led, what we are getting into, and what we must look forward to in the future.

The propagandists for war currently insist that our contribution will be dollars and not men. A little while ago these same propagandists were vehemently insisting that if we would only manufacture and sell planes and other munitions and implements of war to Britain and France there would be neither need nor demand on the part of Britain and her Allies for money or credits.

It is a fact which cannot be denied by any honest and intelligent person that England cannot be the victor in this war, Germany and Italy cannot be defeated, and the subjugated countries released from the oppressions of these dictators without a huge army fighting its way through the subjugated countries and into Germany. England does not have this manpower, and it is perfectly certain that when we are in the war far enough the demand will come for an American expeditionary force of several million American boys to be

sent across to do the fighting. The Navy will, of course, go in first.

Whether all of these moves are or are not proper ones, it is dishonest, un-American, and utterly dangerous to the security of this Nation to try to fool the American people into this war. The necessity now is for a united nation to put forward every possible effort to build up a defense and to send aid to Britain, Greece, and China, since we are now fully and irretrievably embarked on that course. Common sense ought to show the members of the administration and the Congress, as well as the leaders of thought in every section of the country that if the American people are fooled into this war, if they are blindfolded and led step by step into it, we will not be in the war as a united nation but as a divided nation—and that would be fatal in any event.

The American people are entitled to the truth about what is being done. Some of us in Congress are still determined that they shall have those facts, insofar as it remains in our power to reveal them.

Of course, since the President's radio address of Sunday evening, December 29, any citizen, Member of Congress or otherwise, who dares to call for facts, logic, and reason instead of agreeing with whatever policy the administration desires to pursue may expect to be branded either as a "fifth columnist" or "an unwitting aide of the dictators." An attempt has been made to foreclose free and fair discussion of this question of going into war. There are some Members of Congress, however, who do not intend to be terrorized or intimidated by the prospect of the abuse which will come to them for endeavoring to pursue at least a frank and open course in this question of the Nation going to war. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include, following my remarks, a short article by Mr. John T. Flynn, the eminent economist and writer.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The article referred to follows:

NEW YORK, December 30.—A strange report comes from Washington. It has a direct bearing on the proposal to lend merchant ships and warships to Britain.

The report is that Britain has not been able to get enough men to form crews for the destroyers—the 50 destroyers—we have already traded to Britain. Several of these destroyers, we are told, have not yet been put into service because of the lack of crews.

This is due to the fact that England has not been able to train men fast enough to make up for the immense losses that have been sustained by the Navy and the merchant marine as the result of sinkings. Whether this report is true or not remains to be seen. We can only say it comes from a source friendly to England.

If this be true, then what will be the first consequence of lending large numbers of merchant ships and naval vessels to England? There seems little doubt that the next demand will be for men to handle them.

Thus every step we take seems to lead inevitably to the very brink of war. First, lend money to Britain. This cannot be done very well because a loan of money would be grotesque. So, following the logic of the slogan that "This is our war," we find a way around that. Therefore we say lend Britain, not money, but planes, ships, naval vessels, arms. But having gone this far, we are confronted with the proposition that these will be no good to Britain unless we can furnish the skilled men also to handle them. Will we just lend them? And will we say this is not going to war?

At least Congress should, before it takes any step along this fatal road, investigate what it is doing.

Is it a fact that any part of the destroyer fleet already sent to Britain is tied up for lack of men? Is it a fact Britain has not the skilled men to handle such ships and war vessels as we may "lend" to her? And if this is a fact, how will she use these vessels without our loan of men as well as the ships and planes?

This is so vital, so grave a step Congress must ask for unmistakable evidence, not merely the assurance of some interested propagandist. It must have facts, for it is playing with the lives and the democracy of the American people.

The truth is that the "Get into the war" groups were getting bolder every day in this country until William Allen White brought them up with a jerk with his statement. And the basis on which the war groups want us in the war is this very one of men—men in Europe when the time comes, men now where they are most needed in the skilled positions. The other reason, of course, is to create a war dictatorship to speed production.

We have set fire to a little patch of trees in the forest. It will be only a little while before the whole forest will be on fire.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce to my Democratic colleagues that the caucus called for this afternoon at 4 o'clock will be held in the Chamber of the House of Representatives in the Capitol.

THE UNITED STATES AND THE EUROPEAN WAR

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I dislike to find myself in opposition to views expressed by my long-time and devoted friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] who has just addressed the House, but there are two sides to the picture which he has been exhibiting to you, and both are hideous. We have reached the point where the road forks and must take either one branch or the other and, as sensible men, we know that both lead to a state of misery and distress, but as upstanding Americans, we must make our choice.

I grant you that pursuing the course outlined by the President may probably lead us to war, and that war would virtually bankrupt the Nation and possibly mean our coming out in some form of totalitarian state, but I get comfort out of the thought that in the building of a great Army we are creating a stabilizing influence that will bring us through as a free people, and that we will survive as a democracy.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for an additional 3 minutes provided he will yield for a question or two.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the Chair should not entertain that request unless it is satisfactory to the gentlemen who have permission to address the House, but the Chair will put the request if it is satisfactory to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LEWIS], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH]. Is there objection to the request on the part of any of these gentlemen?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 3 additional minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to transgress upon the time already allotted to these gentlemen; but if they have no serious objection, I would like to proceed for at least a few more minutes.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. In just a moment, please.

I gladly concede that the so-called fireside message of the President may be subject to fair criticism because it was, in effect, a Presidential declaration of a will to war if war be the consequence of continued aid to England, but I understood the message as it was spoken in the only language I know; and if I had any criticism to make at all of what he said, it would be that, possibly, it amounted to some encroachment upon the prerogatives of the Congress and that it failed to tell the whole story. The President could have said a great deal more, and all of which I would have approved. I am not criticizing his message. We have committed ourselves to the proposition of extending all possible aid to England short of war, and yet I realize, and I think I know, that going further in this direction means our active participation in war.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. And I know, too, that it will not be a limited affair so far as we are concerned, but that it will be a total war not only as to England but as to the United States as well.

I yield to the gentleman.

LXXXVI—884

Mr. KNUTSON. What has occurred since election to have brought out the remarks made by the President in his bedside talk, or, I mean, fireside talk, Sunday?

Mr. COX. Nothing; unless it be an aroused sentiment that is spreading throughout this entire country. I think the President's message reflects the will, the wish, and the determination of the American people. [Applause.]

Mr. KNUTSON. Does the gentleman think that by our getting into the war we will more securely perpetuate democracy in this country?

Mr. COX. Well, I am not going to say that we will, but it may result—and I have the hope to believe it will result—in saving the British Empire, and in saving the British Empire we save ourselves.

Mr. KNUTSON. Has the gentleman given any thought to the danger that if we get into the war—

Mr. COX. Of course, I have.

Mr. KNUTSON. That we will have totalitarianism in this country?

Mr. COX. Of course, I have given thought to it and the thought has given me great distress. I am not overlooking the fact of what it means to our people to become involved in this war. I know, as I have said, it possibly means bankruptcy and it may mean the loss of our form of government, but I do not think so.

Mr. KNUTSON. Is the gentleman more concerned with the preservation of democracy or the preservation of the British Empire which he just mentioned a moment ago?

Mr. COX. The gentleman knows that I often differ from the President, but I think the President is here trying to save America and he believes that in saving England he makes America secure. That is what I believe.

Mr. KNUTSON. How can we save ourselves by bleeding ourselves white, such as the war will entail?

Mr. COX. We can save ourselves by helping curb the influence which, left unbridled, will enslave our people economically. We want to live a free people and are willing to war for that right.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have 1 additional minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I know in the last session of Congress the gentleman from Georgia was very anxious to have us given full and complete advice as to how we stood regarding national defense. He was not successful. We felt speed, more speed, was needed for our Nation's defense. I tried, as did others, to have that information given to us. I introduced a number of resolutions of inquiry for that express purpose. I know the gentleman in the next session of Congress will insist that we be given full information.

Mr. COX. I think the President should, of course, work in close cooperation with the Congress.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Regarding what is going on in Europe, also the Near East and the Far East and in the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. COX. I think there should be a single mind and a single thought on this whole subject.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. COX. With pleasure.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, in making that statement the gentleman recognizes, and I am sure the gentlewoman from Massachusetts recognizes, that there are some things that are not compatible with public interest to make public.

Mr. COX. Why, of course, I do.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has again expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the trouble with the fireside chat and the thing that bothers real Americans is this: Is it a cloak to cover up the deficiencies of our production of defense supplies? Is it a cloak to cover up the deficiencies which are delaying the construction of cantonments for months and months? That is the thing that bothers real patriotic Americans. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LEWIS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

THE PANAMA CANAL

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on December 21, 1940, I returned from a trip to the Panama Canal Zone, where I spent 4 days. I am sure that all of us recognize that the Panama Canal is the life line of the Nation, not only in a commercial sense but in a military and naval sense as well. With a one-ocean navy and the imminent possibility of having to face naval enemies in two oceans, the Panama Canal affords us the only means of quickly shifting our naval forces from one ocean to another to meet whichever threat is most imminent. It is therefore in a military and naval sense an absolutely vital link in our national defense.

I had previously visited the Canal before Congress had appropriated the hundreds of millions of dollars that have since been authorized or appropriated for its defense, and because I realize that the Canal is such a vital link in our chain of national defense I was anxious to see what progress has been made in its protection. I found the Canal Zone a beehive of activity, with barracks for troops being erected in many parts of the zone and defense works of many kinds in process of construction. I had hoped to see the work of defense much further advanced than it is. It will be months yet before the protective works are completed. Fortresses already existing mount 14-inch and 16-inch guns at both entrances to the Canal, and these in time of war would doubtless be supplemented by mine fields and other defense works, so that an attack by surface ships upon the Canal is practically out of the question.

The rugged terrain on both sides of the Canal for hundreds of miles, covered as it is with tropical jungles and practically completely devoid of highways, or even trails, makes a successful attack from the land almost impossible. The danger to the Canal, therefore, in my opinion, and in the opinion of the military authorities on the grounds with whom I talked, will come from an air attack which will seek to block the Canal by either destroying the locks or the dams that hold back the waters of Gatun Lake or Miraflores Lake, or both. The planes making such an attack could come from an airplane carrier protected by warships and lying several hundred miles at sea in either ocean, or the planes could come from land bases such as the island of Martinique, where a hundred American-made bombers destined for France were taken after the collapse of France last spring. The existence of those bombers at the island of Martinique constitutes a serious potential threat to the safety of the Canal.

There are also in certain Central American and South American countries landing fields for airplanes already constructed, and while no known force of bombing planes is located on any of these fields it might be possible for a potential enemy to transport planes to such fields by means of some of the commerce raiders that are now known to be at sea. It might also be possible for enemy agents to transform existing commercial airplanes into bombers for an attack upon the Canal.

Existing means for defense against an attack from the air consist first of antiaircraft batteries placed at strategic intervals throughout the Canal Zone. These batteries, however, for the most part consist of guns not of the most modern and effective type. Every battery of antiaircraft guns in the Canal Zone should consist of the very latest and best types of antiaircraft guns available. That change should be made immediately.

The other means of defense against bombing from the air is, of course, pursuit planes for the purpose of destroying or driving off an attacking fleet of bombers. In this means of defense the Canal is almost wholly lacking. It is true that there is a force of pursuit and fighter planes in the Canal Zone, but these planes are not of the latest type and their effectiveness against the latest type bombers is very doubtful. Their speed is not the speed of the latest type, and speed in the air as well as armament seems to be the determining factor of air battles. If there is one place in our whole system of national defense where we should have an overwhelming force of the most modern pursuit and fighter planes it is the Canal Zone. Congress should see to it that this vital defect in the defense of the Canal is remedied at once.

In this connection it should be stated that the fortified area around the Canal is entirely too restricted. The Canal Zone consists of a strip of land running across the Isthmus of Panama approximately 10 miles in width. For the successful operation of the Canal in peacetime that width is entirely adequate, but for the adequate protection of the Canal against attacks from the air by modern bombers that now fly at a speed of 350 miles per hour a 10-mile-wide zone is nothing. The United States should proceed immediately to acquire from the Government of Panama the right to fortify strategic points for a distance of at least 300 miles on each side of the Canal. Until this is done it cannot be said that we have adequate protection for the Canal against raids from the air. The acquisition of strategic areas for fortification in the Republic of Panama will, of course, have to be worked out with the authorities of that Republic, but it should be done immediately.

Perhaps the most serious and imminent danger to the Canal, however, is from sabotage. The Canal Zone is, of course, the crossroads of the Western Hemisphere. Upon the Canal converge all steamship lines from east to west. The ships of every nation use the Canal for transit between the oceans. At one time I counted from the air over the Canal 12 ocean steamers anchored off the Pacific end of the Canal awaiting transit and within a few minutes I was able to count an almost equal number anchored off the Atlantic end of the Canal awaiting transit in the other direction. Because it is a crossroads of the western world the population of the Canal Zone is made up of people of practically every race and nationality. In such a polyglot population it is very easy for spies and saboteurs to conceal their identities. It is not too much to say that the Canal Zone and the Panamanian territory adjacent thereto is a hotbed of international spying and intrigue and potential saboteurs. Precautions have naturally been taken by the American authorities charged with the protection of the Canal against possible acts of sabotage. High woven-wire fences surmounted by barbed wire enclose all such vital areas as the locks and dams. Constant guard is maintained both day and night in all such areas. At one time the slopes of Gatun Dam were used as a public golf links. No such use is now permitted. I was informed that only those having official business inside the forbidden areas are permitted to enter, and yet while I was there an exception was made in behalf of certain civilian unofficial guests and they were permitted to see the most secret points of certain vital areas. Doubtless no harm was done by this one exception to the general rule, as I am sure that these unofficial guests were and are loyal, patriotic, and discreet, but the disturbing thing in this instance to me was that there would be any relaxation, especially in times like these, of this most salutary precaution for the protection of the Canal. The disturbing thing is that if the precaution was relaxed in this instance it might as readily be relaxed for some other plausible but unofficial reason advanced by some clever person bent upon sabotage.

It is, of course, a credit to the Canal authorities that when it was learned by them that this exception had been made there was more or less consternation among them and on subsequent days there was no other relaxation of the rule.

Of all the dangers threatening the Canal, the military authorities in charge fear sabotage the most, and, of course, no precaution against sabotage should be omitted and no relaxa-

tion of those precautions should be permitted under any circumstances so long as the present critical situation exists in the world.

I should not close this report to Congress on what I learned at Panama without telling you of a most unfortunate situation that exists with respect to the Government of Panama. The present President of Panama is anti-American and a pro-Nazi in his sympathies. Although he has been in office but a few months he has initiated and procured the adoption of a new constitution along Nazi or Fascist lines. This constitution was approved by a vote of the people of Panama on Sunday, December 15, the day I left Cristobal. I saw the process by which this change was brought about. The polling places were tables placed on the open sidewalks. The voters formed long lines awaiting their turns to vote. There was no secrecy about the ballot. As the voter approached the table, at which the election officers appointed by the President were seated, he was asked whether he wanted to vote for or against the adoption of the constitution. A red ballot was for the adoption of the new constitution and a blue ballot against it. He made his choice known to the Government officials and was given then the ballot which he asked for. Naturally, under such a procedure, threats of reprisals against those who opposed the change in the constitution had tremendous effect and the constitution was overwhelmingly adopted.

The Panama-American, the newspaper published at the city of Panama by Hernando Arias, a former President of the Republic of Panama and a brother of the present President, carried the story while I was in Panama of the appointment by the President of a certain Dr. Brunner from Vienna, Austria, as an adviser in city planning for the Republic of Panama. The story also stated that Dr. Brunner was a member of the Nazi Party of Germany, and in addition to being an expert on city planning he was also an expert aerial photographer. It was further stated that Dr. Brunner had said in an interview that one of the first steps he expected to take in laying out a plan for the cities of Panama was to make an aerial map of the areas under discussion. The areas in question are the cities of Colon, at the Atlantic end of the Canal, which is immediately contiguous to the American city of Cristobal, built within the Canal Zone and only about 4 miles distant from the Gatun locks on the Canal, and the city of Panama, located on the Pacific side and immediately contiguous to the American city of Balboa in the Canal Zone and but 2 or 3 miles distant from the Miraflores locks on the Canal.

The evident purpose of the appointment of Dr. Brunner is to enable the Nazis to obtain aerial photographs of the Canal and the locks. The ostensible purpose of his appointment as a city planner is but the thinnest kind of camouflage for its real purpose. Anyone who has visited the Canal and who has seen the cities of Colon and Panama City can understand that there is no problem of city planning presented by either of these cities. Their populations are small, their areas for expansion are unlimited. There is no problem of crowding or of the necessity for making the most of a limited space.

The American military authorities are tremendously disturbed by the appointment of Dr. Brunner and what he proposes to do and I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that this Nazi spy must at all costs be prevented from making aerial photographs of the Panama Canal and its locks, or adjacent terrain. I sincerely trust that the officials of our Government who are entrusted with the safety of the Canal see to it that the contemplated action of Dr. Brunner shall not be taken.

I shall not be a Member of the Seventy-seventh Congress, but, Mr. Speaker, I sincerely trust that those of you who are will take whatever action is necessary to the end that this life line and vital link in our national defense shall be made impregnable. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 8 minutes.

SELFISHNESS OR WORSE—ARE WE SLACKERS?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, back of the war talk, behind the drive for aid to Britain, is a potent, powerful force which we seem to have ignored. It is secret, yet almost universal.

All seem to have a little of it; some appear to be controlled by it. It can be described in one word—selfishness.

Workers in factories, in cantonments, on projects, and in those industries having to do with national defense, as a rule, are demanding higher wages. They are demanding pay and a half and double pay for overtime and holidays.

Unions are taking advantage of the situation to sell permits to work, which, of course, they have no right to do—a practice which is not only lawless but vicious, and which the legislative authorities seem to lack the courage to stop.

EVERYONE WANTS HIS

Industrialists and businessmen—everyone who has anything to sell—are looking for a higher price. You and I, consciously or unconsciously, perhaps, all too often are wiggling and twisting, wondering whether a real-estate speculation, a purchase of stock or bonds, or some other business transaction, carried on with the war as a background, may not return to us a profit over and above that which we ordinarily would be able to get.

This selfishness, which is characteristic of no particular group or class, which is common to all of us, has not been given the credit due it, nor has its full influence been recognized.

I have talked with farmers about the war, and far too often somewhere in the conversation, after the horrors of war and its cost and its uselessness have all been recognized, has come the question, What will the effect be on the price of farm products?

Many times businessmen seeking war orders, discussing this, that, or the other, have revealed a determination that, if money is to be spent, if profits are to be made, they intend to get their share of it.

SELFISHNESS OR SABOTAGE?

It is to be hoped that it is selfishness, or, to put it in more palatable form, a desire to improve one's condition—a laudable ambition—that is back of the present labor troubles, threats to strike, and strikes which are hindering our national-defense program.

If it is not selfishness or, as stated, a desire to better one's condition, the only other apparent cause is a desire to aid the enemy, who would prevent preparations for adequate national defense.

STRIKES HOLDING UP DELIVERY OF SHAFTING FOR NAVY

When last the House met your attention was called to the threatened strike at the Allis-Chalmers Co. plant at Milwaukee, which has under construction for the United States Navy \$18,000,000 worth of turbine and shafting, and which was threatened with a strike by the C. I. O. if two A. F. of L. workers were restored to their jobs. Such a strike is an absurdity. The threat of a strike for such a reason is preposterous.

MASS PICKET LINE

Under date of December 31 we learned that at Fort Wayne, Ind., where the International Harvester Co. is working on defense orders, 3,300 employees are thrown out of work by a strike. We learned that a picket line of 2,000, including the wives of some of the strikers, has been established around the plant. Does anyone labor under the delusion that a picket line of 2,000 around a plant of that size is peaceful picketing?

THREATENED STRIKE AT FLINT, SCENE OF SIT-DOWN

Under date of January 1 and a Flint, Mich., date line we find a United Press dispatch stating that approximately 12,000 employees at Chevrolet plant No. 9, engaged in the production of motors for Army trucks, will vote next week as to whether they will go on strike.

The coming week the President will probably ask Congress for the appropriation of anywhere from one to three billion dollars for national-defense orders or for aid to Britain.

LESS MUNITIONS FOR SAME MONEY

Let us assume that \$100 buys one rifle. If labor organizations so arrange it that pay and a half or double pay must be paid to the men manufacturing those rifles, it necessarily follows that \$500 will not buy five rifles, but four and one-half or three and one-third or less, depending on the amount of time and a half and double time that the men work.

The extra cost to the taxpayer growing out of limited hours and time and a half and double time for overtime cannot be estimated. It runs into billions or more. It means, too, a material lessening in the quantity of matériel produced. It means, therefore, a curtailment of our defense program.

Likewise advances in the prices of material bring the same result. So, too, will the demand for excessive prices of the finished product.

WHETHER SABOTAGE OR SELFISHNESS, REMEDY NEEDED

The result is the same whether these various activities be caused by selfishness or by desire to aid our enemies or defeat our defense program.

Several remedies have been suggested. One is the outlawing of strikes. Another is the fixing of prices. Another is the drafting of industrial plants and workers.

DICTATORSHIP

It is quite certain that if our national existence is in danger there must be unity of effort. Throughout the past 8 years this administration, by teaching that employees and employers were necessarily enemies, has created a situation where drastic remedies appear to be necessary. The administration itself and through the Senate Civil Liberties Committee, the National Labor Relations Board, and various other governmental agencies, has created in the minds of businessmen and industrialists a suspicion that they will not be fairly treated. It has caused labor organizations and labor organizers to believe that the strong arm of the Government will be extended to aid them in their organizing drives, and that they will receive privileges over and above those available to other citizens.

The result is that now, in this time of at least apparent if not real emergency, we may find ourselves compelled to submit to dictatorial methods and measures.

If men are to be drafted for military service, there are many of us who can see no reason why men should not be drafted for industrial service; no reason why all should not be compelled by law to contribute the financial sinews of war for the common good.

RIGHT TO STRIKE

There are those who say the right to strike shall not be taken from labor. There are others who insist that industrial plants shall not be taken over by the Government. But again if men are to be taken from their homes, put into camps, and forced to face the enemy's guns, there would seem to be no reason why those who remain should not render service when and where and to the extent necessary for the preservation of our Government.

UNITY

We should all be riding in the same boat together and, if it can stem the tide and, by the efforts of all, reach a safe port, well and good. If, on the other hand, it is to be swept over the falls, then all should go down together.

DICTATORSHIP BY THE PEOPLE

Advocating a dictatorship, you say? If that be necessary. But let it be a dictatorship, not of the executive branch, not a dictatorship imposed by a President, for he has no such authority and he should be impeached if he tries to impose one—but of the people, through their representatives; a dictatorship for the people.

Let whatever measures are necessary for the preservation of our union originate and be made law by the people's representatives, the Congress of the United States.

CONGRESS LAYING DOWN ON THE JOB

Too long has Congress ignored the situation, refused to act. Certainly the destiny of our Nation does not rest in the hands of one man. If we refuse to deal with the situation in this coming Congress and to do it promptly and effectively; if we fail to enact and put into force the legislation necessary to give us adequate national preparedness, to meet danger from without and from within, then by our inaction we acknowledge our incompetency or our lack of courage, and we should resign our offices and let the people select representatives equal to the task which confronts the Nation. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to incorporate in the RECORD a radio speech by our colleague the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under special order previously made, the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I thought today, when a number of special orders were asked for, that most of the Members who asked for those special orders were going to discuss the so-called report of the Federal Reserve Board, to which the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] made reference. Since that has not taken place and since this is a matter which calls for most careful thought on the part of every Member of Congress, I do not propose to say most of the things I had asked for this time to say. I do want to say one or two things, however.

And first let me say that if the Federal Reserve Board were, as it ought to be, an agent of Congress controlling the monetary system of this Nation through a public institution and solely in the public interest, we could view this matter differently from what we can do at present. For at present the Board, though appointed by the President, runs an essentially private business. The 12 central Federal Reserve banks are owned completely by the private member banks of the System, and increases in the Board's powers therefore will always be likewise increases in the power of those privately owned banks until we do what should have been done in the first place, namely, make the 12 central Federal Reserve banks the property of the people of the United States.

Turning to the Board's recommendations, I certainly think we have got to consider the many problems connected with our present monetary system. There should be adequate means in someone's hands of preventing inflation. But from the standpoint of conditions at present, I believe strongly that the Board's proposition is premature. The price level at present is not yet back to 80 percent of the price level of 1926. We are very far from full employment as yet. I do not understand why we should get in such a panic every time there is danger of our getting full employment and restoring the price level for basic commodities, but do not correspondingly get excited when a deflation takes place which deprives real wealth of a great proportion of its value with reference to money and causes loss of employment and foreclosure of farms.

I think that one of our difficulties is that we are the victims of what Prof. Irving Fisher calls the "money illusion." We think that property rises and falls in value. We think, for example, that there is less nourishment in the crops you get off the farm in one period than in another, and so with other real wealth, when as a matter of fact, what happens is not that real wealth is worth more or less but that the volume of money is contracted or expanded, and thus each dollar changes in its value relative to real wealth. It is a strange thing that whenever real wealth is rising in value and the dollar declining in purchasing power there is general alarm and concern, whereas when the dollar is becoming dearer and real wealth declining in dollar value, we think a very salutary process is taking place and that somehow we are being punished for some mysterious past misdeeds.

The truth is, of course, that inflation and deflation are both evils to be avoided like the plague, but if one is worse than the other for the people generally and their industry it certainly is deflation.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, now will the gentleman yield? Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Farm prices are about 50 percent of what they were in 1926. At that time cotton was 22 cents a pound; now it is around 10 cents or less. I think if the gentleman will investigate, he will find that the price of wheat at that

time was \$1.50 or \$1.75 a bushel, whereas today it is probably down to 70 cents.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is true, and I am thankful to the gentleman from Mississippi for his contribution, for it strengthens the point I was trying to make.

I should like to warn that these proposals of the Board are illustrative of many, many things and food for much more thought than appears on the surface, and they will require the most careful study of every one of us. I do not propose to try to make an exhaustive speech, obviously, on so important a subject today. I do want to point out, however, that the Board's recommendations propose that the power of the President to issue \$3,000,000,000 of money should be revoked. Why? Basically, because the Board knows, as does everyone else, that the putting of that money into circulation would increase reserves in the banks and thus increase the chance of bank credit inflation at some future time. For every single one of those banks has power to create credit on the basis of fractional cash reserves according to our present law.

As it is, therefore, there would be a multiple expansion, for so long as the fractional reserve system exists the banks themselves can exercise what should be the sovereign right of Congress to create money which the Constitution says belongs to Congress, and to it alone. So the Board wants to take this power from the President mainly, I think, because this money-creating power is exercised by the private banking system.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the gentleman from California that this power in the hands of the President to issue \$3,000,000,000 of currency is the greatest club that could be placed in the hands of the President to forestall such a panic as the Federal Reserve System brought about in 1920.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am inclined to believe that it may have operated that way.

To further illustrate my point and to show why the Board asks for power to increase reserve requirements, as well as for abolition of the President's authority, let me point out that the Board has asked that no more Treasury bonds be sold to banks, but that they be sold to individuals and corporations instead. Here again the reason is that if such Treasury bonds are sold to banks the banks create new money in the form of deposits to buy them with.

In this connection I read the last paragraph of an Associated Press article on the subject:

Experts explained that when a bank buys a Treasury bond the Treasury spends the proceeds, the recipients deposit the money, and this tends to double the volume of bank deposits. However, if an individual or corporation buys the bond, he must first withdraw money from a bank to pay for the security, and this offsets the new deposits to be made by persons receiving Treasury cash.

That is just what I have been saying all these years, but the article is a little ambiguous, as most of these articles are. The point is that when a bank buys a Government bond it simultaneously creates a deposit with which to buy the bond, thus creating in each private bank in effect a little mint. Then the bond becomes security for the deposit and can, in fact, be used as collateral for an issue of Federal Reserve notes. The Board proposes that bonds be not sold to banks because it does not want an expansion of the money. It suggests sales to individuals and corporations. I would point out, however, that, although in such a case the individual or the nonfinancial corporation cannot, of course, create money to buy the bond with and must originally draw from a deposit or supply cash with which to make the purchase, nevertheless, as long as we permit Government bonds to be used as collateral for Federal Reserve notes and leave the fractional reserve system in effect, the purchaser of a bond can take it to a bank and borrow against the bond and the bank can make the loan out of a newly created deposit.

The only point I want to stress at the moment is that with various monetary powers existing in the Federal Reserve System, the President, the Secretary of the Treasury, and every private bank in this country you have a complex and

jumbled pattern of attempted control over your monetary system that simply cannot work effectively. It seems to me that what the Board should propose, instead of withdrawal of this one power from the President, is a clear-cut establishment of a 100-percent safe, 100-percent workable, 100-percent controllable monetary system by establishing over a reasonable period of time dollar-for-dollar reserves behind demand deposits. It is, in my opinion, a very difficult thing for many of the smaller banks to be confronted from time to time with changes in reserve requirements. I am convinced they would be better off if we provided now the means of enabling and requiring all banks to establish 100-percent reserves. This could be done under present circumstances without any disturbing effect, for the volume of excess and required reserves, plus the Government bond holdings of the banks, are, in my opinion, very close to the total of their demand deposits. Certain things would have to be done, of course, to assist the banks in covering their deposits. It would simply mean that there would have to be sufficient cash to cover those demand deposits, but it could be done without harm. Earnest and careful consideration should be given to this 100 percent reserve proposition. And I should like to add that if the banks are permitted to count Government bonds as part of their reserves, and if gradually as the bonds mature they are redeemed or retired simply by replacing them with new cash for reserves, then, in effect, we will have provided for orderly and easy retirement of a great portion of the public debt. Nor could the slightest inflation take place when the new money was created to retire the bonds for the cash would simply replace the bonds as part of legal reserves.

If we have finally come to the place where we really desire to solve this problem, then, in my judgment, what we have got to come to is the setting up of an agency, one agency under the direct control of the Congress of the United States, to exercise in an orderly fashion and according to definite congressional mandate the central economic function of maintaining a dollar of stable purchasing power in the United States. If we would view the whole problem from this standpoint, then, for the first time, it seems to me we would get a better and clearer understanding of these most difficult matters that are so often brought to our attention, and we might arrive at a monetary system which would not only be completely dependable but would make possible continuous expansion of production without periodic inflation and deflation.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to conclude by saying that as far as the Board's recommendation regarding taxes is concerned, it seems to be clear that we will have to have higher taxes, that they should be raised gradually, that they should be raised until the Budget is ultimately balanced, and I am in fundamental agreement with that. However, I would stress that the all-important matter from that standpoint is an increase in the production of wealth and an increase of employment in order to bring about a situation where we are operating our economy on the basis of full production of wealth, because unless we do that first the tax revenues will not be forthcoming. So I come back to where I started from and say I do not believe that any deflationary influences should be put into effect, at least not until such time as we have every man at work and every factory working at full capacity.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] is recognized for 6 minutes.

WELFARE OF NATION

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, a happy New Year to all. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, when the majority leader makes the motion that the House do now adjourn and the Speaker's gavel falls, that will be the end of the Seventy-sixth Congress. That will be the first time in history that a Congress has adjourned because it outlived its time, or because it died for lack of more time. It has run the length of days allotted by law. In the year 1940, a continuous session of 366 days.

We ought to consider whether the Congress that adjourns today and dies tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon a natural death,

a Congress that has not adjourned sine die, has been a good Congress. Are you satisfied with all the things you did during the Seventy-sixth Congress. This is a question that ought to be considered very seriously by every Member of the House so that he will not do something during the Seventy-seventh Congress that he was dissatisfied with during the Seventy-sixth. A good time to make a New Year's resolution.

When I came in here today a couple of Members of the House, and I do not know whether they did this seriously or in jest, asked me the question whether I was going to ask the House, Where are you going to get the money? So far as I am concerned, I did not make any New Year's resolution that I would not ask that question during the next session of the Congress. I believe it is a serious question and one which needs the earnest consideration of good statesmen and the very greatest consideration should be given to that particular question by every Member of the House of Representatives, not simply as a monetary proposition, but from the standpoint of the welfare and the good of America. To me it is an essential question, a difficult question to answer. However, a most important question.

Mr. Speaker, when I think of the exorbitant expenditures of the last session, not only for the routine operation of the Government, but the expenditures that have been requested for national defense, it causes me to shudder and ask myself whether we have done the right thing for the perpetuation of American ideals, the perpetuation of the form of government which we enjoy, and for the perpetuation of the good that may accrue to our children and our children's children for all time.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. Just for a question.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman asked, Where are you going to get the money? Where would the gentleman suggest we get the money? I would like him to discuss that matter.

Mr. RICH. That is a question I can answer very quickly for the most part. I would say, economize in the expenditure of Government funds. I will take the floor at some time in the future to explain that more fully. I have done so in the past many, many times on the floor of the House. I will continue to do so for 2 more years, the Lord being my helper. I asked for this time today not because I want to take a few minutes during the closing hours of this session of Congress, but because I have in my heart and in my mind the great benefit that it means to this country to do just that.

We have talked a lot during the past 2 or 3 years—that is American neutrality and keep America out of war. The very first question that will be brought up during the first session of the Seventy-seventh Congress will be national defense. What for? For the protection of whom? Why, the American people. I am interested in the protection of the American people because I believe in America, and I believe in the American form of government more than I believe in any other people on the face of the earth. I want to do everything I can to preserve our ideals. But when we talk about neutrality, and then hear the fireside chat which we heard on Sunday, a day given over to religious worship, and when I think that the President of the United States chose that time to talk about what is essential for our benefit to protect this country in case of war, in my opinion that was an ill-chosen time.

Then we heard the request for aid to Great Britain on Sunday night. What kind of aid? Was it for food, clothing, and things to make the people happy and contented? No; sorry to say, it was for cannon, tanks, powder, dynamite, submarines, war vessels, TNT—anything that will kill, murder, shoot, annihilate. Where is our good-neighbor policy? Where is the Golden Rule—"Do unto others as ye would that men should do unto you"—exemplified in war? War is hell as it is conducted in Europe today. Hell on earth for those people engaged in it. I quite agree with Senator WHEELER, of Montana, that we should offer all aid and assistance to try to settle the differences if it can be done by arbitration, by peaceful methods, by kindness, before we commit acts of war that will bring trouble, that will bring hardships, anguish, and destruction to our American Government and despera-

tion to our American people. God grant that we be kept from such hell on earth as the aerial warfare now being conducted in Europe.

Let us try, first, to stop the war. Do not try to get into war. Do not let war prosperity fool us into thinking it is good for American business, American jobs. It is anything but that, as time will only reveal. Do not let it fool you into thinking it will cover up the errors of the past 10 years and that they will be forgotten. To get into war will wreck America forever and set up a dictatorship absolute. Stop un-American activities by placing any person who would destroy our Government that may be in our midst in concentration camps, and do it at once. Do not procrastinate.

When I heard the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox], a few moments ago, make the statement that, in effect, the President's fireside chat, and I quote, "was a Presidential declaration of war," I say that we are confronted at the present time with a serious situation. I say we do not want any Presidential declaration of war. You should not permit it. You have been elected by your people to do your duty to them and to this country sincerely and fearlessly. You should not be persuaded by anybody but your own conscience and by the constituents you represent. I have many constituents in my district who say, "Loan, lend, spend, and do everything you can to help somebody else," but I say my first obligation, my first duty, and my first principle is to protect and defend America and have our own defenses prepared before we give anything away to some foreign country.

Mr. Speaker, now that we are about to adjourn, this Congress ought to reflect on what it did during the past 2 years and resolve that those things it does in the future will be for the benefit of our country, our people, and our flag. God save America! Give us peace, happiness, and love for all mankind. Guide our every act and deed for the good of all is my prayer. I now adjourn this Congress, so far as I am concerned, sine die.

[Here the gavel fell.]

MINORITY VIEWS OF HOUSE COMMITTEE INVESTIGATING THE LABOR BOARD AND WAGNER ACT

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, in behalf of the gentleman from Utah, Congressman MURDOCK, and myself the minority members of the House Committee Investigating the Labor Board and Wagner Act, I had intended to request special permission from this House to prepare and issue a detailed report after the close of this session. This was made necessary by the action of the majority in filing a voluminous report only 4 days ago. Of course, we are not in accord with all of the views expressed in the majority report. I understand, however, that under the rules we cannot be permitted to file our report after midnight tonight. I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that the minority members of this committee may have until midnight tonight to file our minority views, which must, because of these circumstances, be expressed in summary fashion. It is our intention, however, to make known in detail our conclusions with respect to the investigation of this committee, although this future report must necessarily lack formal status.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts? There is no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an article I have written for a magazine.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

THE UNITED STATES AND THE EUROPEAN WAR

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order to reply very briefly to the statement made by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] in his interpretation of the Presi-

dent's fireside chat. He said very frankly on the floor of the House that he interpreted it as a Presidential declaration of war. I listened to that fireside address, and I approve of it. I believe the President made one of the soundest and most forceful addresses he has ever made to the American people. I do not interpret any part of the President's radio speech as a declaration of war. Nothing he said in that address could possibly be construed as asking this country to go to war.

The President very properly served notice upon the dictator nations, upon the Axis Powers, that we would continue with our own American foreign policy regardless of threats from them. I interpret it to be sound American doctrine when he said that we would continue to aid Great Britain short of war, that we would provide more than we have in the past, that we would increase our production, and that we would give additional priority to Great Britain, all of which is short of war, short of war under our own law, under international law, and under the Constitution.

As the President well pointed out, Sweden and Soviet Russia have been supplying Germany with arms and ammunition during this war, and for years Germany has likewise been supplying belligerent nations with arms, ammunition, and airplanes—all of which is under and within well-recognized principles of international law.

If the gentleman from Georgia wants to raise the issue of war or peace, then let us raise it right now, but openly and aboveboard. Ninety percent of the American people are opposed to our entrance into a war unless we are attacked. On the other hand, 90 percent are in favor of aid to Great Britain short of war, but they are not in favor of aid to Great Britain when it means short cuts to war, or where it means short of peace.

In the next Congress there will be one great issue that will transcend all party lines—that will be greater than any political party or both parties combined—because it affects the security and destiny of America and the safety of its people. This issue will be, Shall we participate in this war or shall we stay out? If the Members of Congress represent their constituents, 90 percent of whom want us to stay out of war, they will not vote for war in the next Congress; but if we listen to the siren, warlike voices of the 10 percent and of the big international press of the East and those who are urging by every possible means, not measures short of war but short cuts to war, then we will be in the war in the next Congress. After all, we of Congress are the ones who must decide, with the advice of our constituents back home, whether or not we will be involved.

I agree, however, with the remarks of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] when he said, and properly so, that there is no such thing as a half-way war. If we are involved in war, it will be a total war—a war on all continents. Millions of American soldiers will be sent to the battlefields of China, Africa, and Europe. I know no other kind of war. If war is declared by Congress, then I expect to enlist. I hope to serve if war is declared, but God forbid that we become involved. I know no other way to fight or to wage war except to final victory. That means a total war, no matter what the expense, whether it is \$200,000,000,000 or whether it takes a million lives. I predict that if we are involved in a war, it may mean that children yet unborn may be fighting in that war, and that the lives of millions of American soldiers will be sacrificed on many foreign battlefields—in Europe, in China, and in Africa.

So before we decide this issue of war or peace, I want to state that I believe that the speech of the President was sound American doctrine, asking for nothing more than aid to Britain short of war. But if he should ask the Congress for a modification of the Neutrality Act to permit our ships to go on the high seas into the war zones and to escort or convoy British ships, then everybody knows that would be virtually an act of war, as our ships will be torpedoed and we will then be in the war within a few months' time. However, the President made no such suggestion. I take this opportunity to contradict the interpretation made on the President's speech by the gentleman from Georgia, and I believe the next

Congress will reflect the opinion of the American people and keep this country out of war. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be granted until midnight tonight to extend their own remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein certain remarks made at the celebration of Pan American Aviation Day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 7965. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. T. G. Ramsey;

H. R. 10712. An act to permit the relinquishment or modification of certain restrictions upon the use of lands along the Natchez Trace Parkway in the village of French Camp, Miss.; and

H. J. Res. 623. Joint resolution to extend the date for filing a report by the United States Commission for the Celebration of the Two Hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas Jefferson.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President for his approval bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 7965. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. T. G. Ramsey.

H. R. 10712. An act to permit the relinquishment or modification of certain restrictions upon the use of lands along the Natchez Trace Parkway in the village of French Camp, Miss.

H. J. Res. 623. Joint Resolution to extend the date for filing a report by the United States Commission for the Celebration of the Two Hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas Jefferson.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 4085. An act for the relief of Max von der Porten and his wife Charlotte von der Porten;

S. 4227. An act for the relief of Herbert Zucker, Emma Zucker, Hanni Zucker, Dorrit Claire Zucker, and Martha Hirsch; and

S. 4415. An act to amend the act entitled "An act in relation to pandering, to define and prohibit the same, and to provide for the punishment thereof," approved June 25, 1910.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

APPROVAL OF HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SUBSEQUENT TO FINAL ADJOURNMENT

The President of the United States, subsequent to the final adjournment of the third session of the Seventy-sixth Congress, notified the Clerk of the House of Representatives that on the following dates he approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

December 30, 1940:

H. R. 8665. An act to provide for the issuance of a license to practice chiropractic in the District of Columbia to Lou Davis.

January 7, 1941:

H. R. 7965. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. T. G. Ramsey.

H. R. 10098. An act to amend section 204 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the termination of Federal control of railroads and systems of transportation; to provide for the settlement of disputes between carriers and their employees; to further amend an act entitled 'An act to regulate commerce' approved February 4, 1887, as amended, and for other purposes", approved February 28, 1920.

H. R. 10712. An act to permit the relinquishment or modification of certain restrictions upon the use of lands along the Natchez Trace Parkway in the village of French Camp, Miss.

January 9, 1941:

H. J. Res. 623. Joint Resolution to extend the date for filing a report by the United States Commission for the Celebration of the Two Hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas Jefferson.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE SUBSEQUENT TO FINAL ADJOURNMENT

The Secretary of the Senate, subsequent to the final adjournment of the third session of the Seventy-sixth Congress, notified the Clerk of the House of Representatives that the President of the United States had informed him that on January 3, 1941, he approved and signed bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 4227. An act for the relief of Herbert Zucker, Emma Zucker, Hanni Zucker, Dorrit Claire Zucker, and Martha Hirsch.

S. 4415. An act to amend the act entitled "An act in relation to pandering, to define and prohibit the same and to provide for the punishment thereof", approved June 25, 1910.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2087. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report of awards made in accordance with the act of March 5, 1940; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2088. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report of awards made in accordance with provisions of the act of March 5, 1940; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2089. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report pursuant to section 3 (c) of the amendatory Helium Act approved September 1, 1937 (50 Stat. 885), showing the amount of moneys credited to such helium-production fund and the amount of disbursements made therefrom during the preceding fiscal year, and the unexpended and unobligated balances on hand in such fund as of the end of the fiscal year ended June 30, 1940; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2090. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report covering the fiscal year 1940 for the National Park Trust Fund Board; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

2091. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an itemized report of transactions for account of the Pershing Hall memorial fund; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

2092. A letter from the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting a special report to Congress by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the presidents of the Federal Reserve banks, and the Federal Advisory Council; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2093. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Twenty-sixth Annual Report of the Federal Trade Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1940; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2094. A letter from the President, Electric Home and Farm Authority, transmitting the fifth annual report, covering operations from July 1, 1939, to June 30, 1940, inclusive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2095. A letter from the chairman of the board for the board of directors, Tennessee Valley Authority, transmitting a report of expenditures for the 12 months ended November 30,

1940, of funds derived from the sale of bonds under section 15c of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. HEALEY: Special Committee to Investigate the National Labor Relations Board. Part II, minority views on House Resolution 258. Resolution creating a select committee to investigate the National Labor Relations Board (Rept. No. 3109). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WHITTINGTON: Select Committee to Investigate Campaign Expenditures. Report pursuant to House Resolution 344. Resolution providing for the appointment of a special committee of the House of Representatives to investigate the campaign expenditures of the various candidates for the House of Representatives, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 3110). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COLE of Maryland: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Report pursuant to House Resolution 290. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to conduct an investigation of the petroleum industry (Rept. No. 3111). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ROBERTSON: Select Committee on Conservation of Wildlife Resources. Report pursuant to House Resolution 65. Resolution authorizing the Special Committee on Wildlife Conservation, appointed under authority of House Resolution 237, Seventy-third Congress, continued under authority of House Resolution 44, Seventy-fourth Congress, and House Resolution 11, Seventy-fifth Congress, to continue its investigations during the Seventy-sixth Congress (Rept. No. 3112). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. TOLAN: Select Committee to Investigate the Interstate Migrations of Destitute Citizens. Report pursuant to House Resolution 63. Resolution authorizing a select committee to investigate the interstate migration of destitute citizens (Rept. No. 3113). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

9425. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Portland Association of Technical Engineers and Architects, Portland, Oreg., urging consideration of their resolution with reference to bills S. 4390, H. R. 10584, and H. R. 10586; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

9426. Also, petition of the National Seaway Council, Washington, D. C., urging consideration of their resolution with reference to the St. Lawrence seaway and navigation and power project; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JANUARY 3, 1941

(Legislative day of Tuesday, November 19, 1940)

The Senate met in its Chamber at 11:30 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Z. Barney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Creator of all things visible and invisible, who art without beginning or end of days: Into Thy holy keeping we commit ourselves this day as the sum of our endeavors in this momentous period of time is completed. Do Thou bless and strengthen all that hath been ably done; pardon whatever hath been left undone or done amiss and grant, as we stand upon the threshold of a new emprise, that